REMARKS

In the Office Action, the Examiner noted that claims 1-12, 15, and 16 are pending in the application. The Examiner rejected claims 1-12, 15, and 16. Claims 1, 2, 9, 11, 15, and 16 have been amended, and new claims 17 and 18 have been added. Thus, claims 1-12, and 15-18 are pending in the application. The Examiner's rejections are traversed below, and reconsideration of all rejected claims is respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections Under 35 USC § 112

In item 4 on pages 4-5 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claim 16 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicants regard as the invention.

Claim 16 has been amended to remove the language at issue. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the § 112 rejections of claim 16.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

In item 6 on pages 6-12 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1-4, 9-12, and 15-16 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,587,969, issued to Weinberg (hereinafter referred to as "Weinberg") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,993,657, issued to Renner (hereinafter referred to as "Renner"). The Applicants respectfully traverse the Examiner's rejection of the claims.

Applicants respectfully submit that in the present invention, as indicated by the language of currently amended independent claims 1, 9, and 11, the "formal requirements" are "defined in the structured document by using a first tag and parameters thereof," and candidate data is generated based on the formal requirements.

In contrast to the present invention, Weinberg merely discloses recording what the user has actually entered and allowing the user to edit the recorded steps. Renner merely provides examples of XML templates for website design and displays XML documents produced by using the templates.

Therefore, as neither Weinberg nor Renner discloses or suggests at least the above-identified features of the independent claims of the present invention, the independent claims are patentable over the references. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

As currently amended claim 15 recites language similar to that of independent claim 1, claim 15 is patentable over the references for at least the reasons presented for independent

claim 1. As claims 2-4, 10, 12, and 16 depend from independent claim 1 and include all of the features of claim 1, it is respectfully submitted that claims 2-4, 10, 12, and 16 are also patentably distinguishable over Weinberg and Renner.

In item 7 on pages 12-13 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 5 and 6 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Weinberg "in view obviousness."

As dependent claims 5 and 6 depend from independent claim 1, the dependent claims are patentable over the reference for at least the reasons presented for independent claim 1.

In item 8 on pages 13-14 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claim 7 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Weinberg in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,446,120 B1, issued to Dantressangle (hereinafter referred to as "Dantressangle").

As previously indicated, Weinberg fails to teach or suggest, "formal requirements" are "defined in the structured document by using a first tag and parameters thereof," and candidate data is generated based on the formal requirements.

Applicants respectfully submit that Dantressangle also fails to teach or suggest the above-identified features of the claims, as Dantressangle merely discloses the transmission of commands from a browser computer to a server computer. Therefore, claim 7, via independent claim 1, is patentable over the references, as neither of the references, alone or in combination, teaches or suggests the above-identified features of the claims.

In item 9 on pages 14-15 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claim 8 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Weinberg in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,072,489, issued to Gough (hereinafter referred to as "Gough").

As previously indicated, Weinberg fails to teach or suggest, "formal requirements" are "defined in the structured document by using a first tag and parameters thereof," and candidate data is generated based on the formal requirements.

Applicants respectfully submit that Gough also does not teach or suggest the features, as Gough is simply directed to processing of opaque and translucent images. Therefore, claim 8, via currently amended independent claim 1, is patentable over the references, as neither of the references, taken alone or in combination, teaches or suggests the above-identified feature of the independent claims.

In item 10 on pages 15-21 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1-3, 7, 9-12 and 15-16 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Publication No.

2001/0028359 A1, issued to Muraishi et al. (hereinafter referred to as "Muraishi") in view of Renner.

In contrast to the present invention, Muraishi discloses generating a test pattern and input data file for screen definition information 15 (FIG. 4), which seemingly suggests generating candidate data based on formal requirements. As can be seen in FIG. 7 of Muraishi, the screen definition information 15 is contained in a separate file 15 (FIG. 7) defining a screen, rather than in the test target screen class 28 (FIG. 7).

As is clearly indicated in independent claims 1, 9, and 11, the formal requirements are defined in the structured document by using a first tag and its parameters, and they are acquired upon reception of the structured document from the server computer (see acquiring means or step). The claims also recites that the structured document can be browsed by a document browsing device (see preamble), which clearly indicates that the structure document under test is a "test target class" in Muranishi's terminology. That is, the present invention differs from Muranishi in that the formal requirements are acquired from the document under test. Other references, or combinations of references, fail to suggest the feature (as previously indicated, for example, Renner merely provides examples of XML templates for website design and shows XML documents produced by using the templates).

New Claims 17 and 18

New dependent claim 17 recites, "the data to be inputted into the data input area is a piece of text", "the formal requirements specify a maximum length of the piece of text", and "the candidate data for the text violates the specified maximum length." None of the combinations of references suggest such candidate data.

New dependent claim 18 recites "the candidate data includes a wording indicating that the text is longer than specified maximum length." An example of candidate data is "### MAXIMUM LENGTH+1 ###," shown in FIG. 1. With the feature of claim 18, the test operator can recognize when he/she has selected the candidate and that he/she is going to test the document with an abnormal input. None of the combination of references suggest such candidate data.

There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is respectfully submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.

Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after the response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: 8/7/06

By: _____
Reginald D. Lucas
Registration No. 46,883

1201 New York Avenue, NW, 7th Floor
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501